



## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/626,115	07/24/2003	H. William Harris JR.	2213.1004-012	9402	
21005	7590 12/17/2004		EXAM	EXAMINER	
HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.			ABBOTT, YVO	ABBOTT, YVONNE RENEE	
530 VIRGINIA P.O. BOX 913			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
CONCORD,	MA 01742-9133		3644		
			DATE MAILED: 12/17/200	4	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	$-\mathcal{U}$		
Office Action Summary		10/626,115	HARRIS ET AL.	1/2		
		Examiner	Art Unit	<del></del>		
		Yvonne R. Abbott	3644			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication apported to the communication apport.	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence addres	s		
THE - Exte after - If the - If NO - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. a period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl D period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period vire to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this commun D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nication.		
Status						
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 Ju	ulv 2003.				
	·	action is non-final.				
3)	, <del></del>					
Disposit	ion of Claims					
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1 and 2</u> is/are pending in the applicat 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) <u>2</u> is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.				
Applicati	ion Papers					
10)⊠	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on <u>24 July 2003</u> is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	☑ accepted or b)☐ objected to b drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See tion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.			
Priority ι	under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
a)(	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign  All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document  2. Certified copies of the priority document  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document  application from the International Bureau  See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Application rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stag	ge		
2) Notice Notice 3) Information	et(s) te of References Cited (PTO-892) te of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) or No(s)/Mail Date 11/17/04.	4)  Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5)  Notice of Informal P 6)  Other:		)		

Application/Control Number: 10/626,115

Art Unit: 3644

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hjaltason et al. (6,789,502). Hightason et al. disclose an aquatic food composition comprising at least 0.5 wt% sodium chloride (col. 6, lines 6-14). Although Hialtason does not specifically discloses that the weight percentage of NaCl in the composition is between 1-10%, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made in order to provide the optimal aquaculture environment for a particular species. Since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum ranges involves only routine skill in the art. In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233. The normal desire of scientists or artisans to improve upon what is already generally known provides the motivation to determine where in a disclosed set of percentage ranges is the optimum combination of percentages. See In re Boesch, 617 F.2d 272, 276, 205 USPQ 215, 219 (CCPA 1980) ("[D]iscovery of an optimum value of a result effective variable in a known process is ordinarily within the skill of the art." See, e.g., In re Baird, 16 F.3d 380, 29 USPQ2d 1550 (Fed. Cir. 1994); <u>In re Jones</u>, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). *In*

Application/Control Number: 10/626,115 Page 3

Art Unit: 3644

re Peterson Appeal No. 02-1189 (Fed. Cir. January 8, 2003). Where routing testing and general experimental conditions are present, discovering the optimum or workable ranges until the desired effect is achieved involves only routing skill in the art.

3. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seawright (6,065,245). Seawright discloses an aquaculture diet composition comprising sodium chloride (Tables 16.3, 1634,17.1), however, the claimed weight percentages aren't specifically disclosed. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the claimed weight percentage of NaCl in the Seawright composition in order to provide the optimal concentration of nutrient requirements of the aquaculture; additionally, it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

## Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claim 2 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yvonne R. Abbott whose telephone number is (703)308-2866. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs 9:30am-6:00pm.

Art Unit: 3644

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Teri Luu can be reached on (703)305-7421. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Yvonne R. Abbott Primary Examiner Art Unit 3644

12/9/04